



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

three times to the dead man's departed spirit. The dead man had brought nothing into the world, but it was hard that he should carry nothing out of it. Hence the mourners placed vases and various other ornaments in the grave. He might need them in the dim region to which he was going. Often terracotta imitations of shoes were thrown in the grave to enable the dead man to travel the hard road to the Styx. The soil was shovelled back, the procession returned to the home of the dead man, where the nearer relatives kept up the mourning together with fasting. At the end of three days, and, perhaps again on the ninth, came another banquet, as in Greece to-day, and so the ceremonial for the dead was completed.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY. DAVID M. ROBINSON.

REVIEW

A History of Greek Sculpture. By Rufus B. Richardson. New York: American Book Company (1911). Pp. 291. \$2.00.

To the lover of Greek sculpture this book will be as disappointing as it is apt to be misleading to the seeker after knowledge. This result is due not as much to absolute error, of which the book is comparatively free, as to carelessness of statement on the author's part and to mistaken emphasis in the handling of his material. It is perhaps natural that to the neophyte the sculptures of the Hellenistic age should appeal more strongly than the ideal creations of the fifth and the fourth centuries, remote as these are from modern standards; but from the scholar and the writer on Greek art greater discrimination of judgment can rightly be demanded. Yet it is upon the works of the period subsequent to Alexander that Professor Richardson lavishes his greatest enthusiasm. The writer would yield to no one in admiration for the magnificent Nike of Samothrace, but he seriously questions whether "Paionios and other sculptors of the fifth century might well hide their heads before this creation" (p. 250), fine as it is. He doubts also whether the pose of the Apollo Belvedere is "splendid" (269) or the attitude of the Fortune of Antioch, graceful as it is, is "superb" and reveals unmistakably "dignity and pride, as befitted Antioch" (273). But, above all, he feels that an emphatic protest is necessary when he reads (264) that "on the face of Laocoön, especially in the eyes, pity and terror are seen in most acute form" and that "the suffering face might readily be compared to that of the crucified one on the cross". As a study of physical agony, of the human body in torment, the figure of Laocoön is probably unsurpassed in the whole range of art, but it can not be too strongly emphasized that of pity or any other emotion of the soul or of the mind it offers not the slightest suggestion.

Entirely apart, however, from any question as to the relative merits of works of the different periods, the book contains numerous statements so carelessly expressed that they are bound to mislead a student not already familiar with the subject. To illustrate—would any person unacquainted with the originals form a correct conception of the coloring of the archaic limestone sculptures of the Acropolis from the statement on page 26 that they "have the paint laid on, as it were, with a trowel"? Similarly the statement on page 207 that the Nike of Paionios is "still supported by an eagle which flies somewhat crosswise to her path" must convey an entirely wrong impression of the artist's real conception, although fortunately in this case the reader can judge for himself from the adjoining illustration. In other cases this carelessness amounts to absolute inaccuracy. Thus we read on page 90 with reference to the marble Athena of the pedimental group on the Acropolis that "One sees in her face pitiless wrath flashing forth as she strikes down her foe", when in reality her face is as impassive and as lacking in emotion as that of all contemporary statues. Again on page 211 we are told that the boy on the sepulchral stele from the Ilissos in Fig. 96 is "crushed with grief", although the expression of such intensity of emotion as is implied in the quoted words is entirely foreign to the spirit of Attic art and would be without parallel in any fifth or fourth century funeral relief. The boy is at most quietly weeping. Probably few scholars, if any, would agree with Professor Richardson's judgement that the metopes of the Theseum "show quite as wide a divergence in style as those of the Parthenon" (p. 195), while the statement on page 63 that on the Herakles metope from Selinus the Korkopes are represented as slung over the hero's shoulders "probably on a pole represented in paint" is incorrect, since the pole is depicted plastically. It is, however, merely amusing when a helmeted warrior on the Bassae frieze is referred to as "a man with a fez" (p. 201) or even when, with careless disregard of fact, the author tells us on page 128 that in the west gable group at Olympia Theseus and Peirithoös are striking the centaurs "with battle-axes", although in the illustration of the restored pediment to which he refers (Fig. 61) the latter is represented with a sword in his hands. The student who reads on the same page that "Theseus is next to Apollo the finest figure in the gable" may be somewhat surprised to learn that of the figure thus praised only the head, the lower part of the abdomen, the left thigh and foot, and the lower part of the right leg with some fragments of the drapery are original.

Examples of similar carelessness in other directions are not lacking but a few instances must suffice. The term "isokephaly" is first used on page

49 but no explanation of it is given until the first footnote on page 186. Of the Themis from Rhamnus it is stated on page 243 "That she really belongs in our period" (i. e. the Hellenistic age) "is indicated by the chiton", but no mention is made of the inscription that fixes her approximate date beyond doubt. In like manner the epigraphical evidence for the date of Damophon, first emphasized by Miss Tnallon in *The American Journal of Archaeology* 10 (1906), 302-329, is entirely disregarded. Finally, is it "beyond question" that we have copies of Praxiteles's famous Eros and Satyr (p. 219), and is it a fact that "The Skopas eye enables us to see in the Demeter of Knidos a work of that master" (p. 228)?

Enough has been said to indicate the dangers that lurk in this book for the beginner. Such an one would gain a better and far more accurate idea of Greek sculpture from the short chapter on that subject by Professor Fowler in the volume on Greek Archaeology in the same series of handbooks.

As regards the printer's part only one misprint, "cast" for "east" gable, on p. 110, was noted. The illustrations, however, leave much to be desired and unfortunately some of the most important works for the study of the style of individual artists, such as the Doryphoros and the Diadumenos of Polykleitos, the Hermes of Praxiteles, and the Agias of Lysippos, are among those which are most inadequately reproduced.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

CLARENCE H. YOUNG.

THE NEW YORK LATIN CLUB

The first meeting of the season held by the New York Latin Club at the Gregorian on Saturday, November eighteenth was largely attended. Fortunately the rain of the early morning ceased ere noon and the weather was fair for the gathering. Several prominent members whose duties called them elsewhere were conspicuous by their absence, and the fact that Yale and Princeton played a match game of football on Saturday also drew away some members who are customarily present at the luncheons of the Club.

Notwithstanding these defections the company was large and appreciative, due in part to new members who were present.

In introducing Principal William Peterson of McGill University to the Club, President Harter said that we could not advocate too warmly a reciprocity of scholarship between Canada and the United States; and at the close of the meeting it was the generally expressed sentiment that the address of Principal Peterson had made us all debtors to the country which had sent us so able and entertaining a speaker.

He spoke on Some recent Work on Cicero's

Speeches, and was good enough to give an account of some experiences of himself and his collaborator, Professor Clark of Oxford, in preparing the text of Cicero for the Oxford Press. Following the speaker's narrative all present grew deeply interested in collecting manuscripts and tracing their history back till they were surely identified as direct descendants from certain archetypes and fixing the centuries to which they severally belong. A theme which might be dry if treated in mechanical fashion became in Principal Peterson's handling brimful of interest. In particular, great enthusiasm was manifested in his wonderful success in identifying a manuscript, marked 14th century, belonging to a private collection in Norfolk, England, with a very valuable one of the 9th century, numbered 498 in the catalogue of Cluny manuscripts, thus vastly increasing its importance and authority. Under the discerning treatment of these modern editors of Cicero the text in several instances has been so improved that the orator at last is made to say what in all probability he did say, though for centuries he has uttered no better than nonsense in passages carelessly transcribed by copyists.

Although the address dealt so largely with personal experiences it lacked all flavor of egotism, and the audience was delighted with a record of such scholarly accomplishment, which is all the more wonderful as the work of a man who is administrative head of a great university. Frequent applause marked the deep appreciation with which the address was received. Although Dr. Peterson read no paper he has consented to send an abstract of his speech in the near future for publication in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, which will be of interest to its readers, even though the printed word must lack the special charm of Dr. Peterson's delivery.

Dr. Tibbetts read his annual statement as Treasurer of the Club, which showed the finances of the Club in satisfactory condition. He also presented a report of progress from the committee appointed last February to confer with New York School officials on the subject of First Year Latin.

THE WADLEIGH
HIGH SCHOOL.

ANNA P. MACVAY, Censor.

Professor C. H. Weller, of the University of Iowa, sends us the following note:

I append below a copy of a letter recently received from Theodore Roosevelt. It speaks for itself and I need make no comment. Upon my request, he gave me permission to publish it.

If I get the chance I will gladly say all I can for the study of Greek. Unfortunately I never grew so that I myself really enjoyed Greek literature in the original, but my son in Africa read no book more steadily than his Homer, both the Iliad and Odyssey, which he had with him in Greek.
Theodore Roosevelt.